



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,324	02/26/2002	Anatoliy Panasyuk	2006579-0420	4049
24280	7590	06/13/2006		EXAMINER
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110				HENNING, MATTHEW T
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/083,324	PANASYUK ET AL.
	Examiner Matthew T. Henning	Art Unit 2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-68 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-68 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

1                   This action is in response to the communication filed on 3/27/2006.

2                   **DETAILED ACTION**

3                   *Response to Arguments*

4                   Applicant's arguments filed 3/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not  
5                   persuasive.

6                   Regarding applicants' argument that "further detailed illustration of the[] features in the  
7                   Figures is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention", the examiner does not find  
8                   the argument persuasive. 37 CFR 1.83(a) states that the drawings must show every feature of the  
9                   invention as specified in the claims. Therefore, what one of ordinary skill in the art would  
10                  understand from the drawings is not relevant to the objection, but instead the features which are  
11                  claimed must be shown in the drawings. As such, as admitted by the applicants, on pages 12-13  
12                  of the communication dated 3/27/2006, the claimed features pointed to by the examiner are not  
13                  shown, and therefore the drawings do not comply with 37 CFR 1.83(a). Therefore, the examiner  
14                  has maintained the objection to the drawings below.

15                  Regarding applicants' argument that Brezak does not disclose "a ticket...comprising a  
16                  first ticket and a second ticket", the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. Brezak  
17                  clearly disclosed a first ticket (a TGT or ticket granting ticket) and a second ticket (a service  
18                  ticket). There is no requirement that the "a ticket" be anything more than two single tickets, as  
19                  argued by the applicants. And in fact, paragraph 0055 of the specification states that "the ticket  
20                  authority 225 may issue more than one ticket rather than issuing one ticket having many parts."  
21                  The limitation in the claim does not require one ticket having many parts, but instead clearly

1 claims two (multiple) tickets. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive and  
2 has therefore maintained the rejection below.

3       Regarding applicants' argument that Brezak does not disclose a first ticket authority  
4       generating a first ticket and a second ticket authority generating a second ticket, the examiner  
5       does not find the argument persuasive. Brezak disclosed an authentication service (206) inside  
6       of a trusted third party (204), and further that the authentication service generated the tickets, as  
7       seen in Brezak Paragraphs 0040, 0042, and 0043. Because the authentication resided within the  
8       trusted third party, the trusted third party inherently generated the tickets as well, and therefore  
9       Brezak meets the limitations of the claim language. This is analogous to a freezer which  
10      contains an icemaker. When the icemaker makes ice, it is also correct to say that the freezer  
11      made the ice because the ice maker is part of the freezer. Further, there is no requirement in the  
12      claim language that the ticket authorities be spatially or physically separate, nor is there a  
13      requirement that neither authority generates both tickets. As such, the examiner does not find the  
14      argument persuasive.

15 Claims 1-68 have been examined.

16 All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

17 *Drawings*

18 The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every  
19 feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the disabled ticket and the enabled  
20 ticket, as well as the step of enabling the disabled ticket must be shown or the feature(s) canceled  
21 from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Art Unit: 2131

1        Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to  
2        the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing  
3        sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet,  
4        even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing  
5        should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure  
6        must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must  
7        be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the  
8        drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the  
9        renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an  
10      application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet”  
11      pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will  
12      be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The  
13      objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

15 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the  
16 basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

17 *A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –*

18 (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section  
19 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or  
20 (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the  
21 invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the  
22 treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an  
23 application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United  
24 States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

25

1       Claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 44-52, 56-64, and 66-68 are rejected under 35  
2 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brezak et al. (US Patent Application Publication  
3 2003/0018913) hereinafter referred to as Brezak.

4       Regarding claim 1, Brezak disclosed a method of authenticating a client to a content  
5 server (See Brezak Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising the steps of: generating, by a ticket authority  
6 (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206), a ticket associated with said client (See Brezak Paragraphs  
7 0042-0043), said ticket comprising a first ticket and a second ticket wherein said second ticket is  
8 disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); transmitting, by said ticket  
9 authority, said first ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraph 0042-0043); validating, by said  
10 ticket authority, said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045-0048); using, by said  
11 client, said first ticket to establish a communication session with a content server proxy after said  
12 first ticket is validated (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043-0045); enabling, by said ticket authority,  
13 said second ticket for use upon said validation of said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-  
14 0048); and using, by said content server proxy, said enabled second ticket to establish a  
15 communication session with said content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048).

16       Regarding claim 23, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak  
17 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority (See  
18 Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206); a content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 214); and a content  
19 server proxy (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) in communication with said client, said ticket  
20 authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2), wherein said ticket authority generates a  
21 ticket associated with said client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043), said ticket comprising a  
22 first ticket and a second ticket, wherein said first ticket is transmitted to said client and used to

1 establish a first communication session with said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs  
2 0042-0043 and 0045), and wherein said second ticket is transmitted to said content server proxy  
3 and used to establish a second communication session with said content server (See Brezak  
4 Paragraphs 0043 and 0045).

5 Regarding claim 45, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak  
6 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority  
7 generating a ticket associated with said client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206 and Paragraphs  
8 0042-0043), said ticket comprising a first ticket and a second ticket wherein said second ticket is  
9 disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); a content server (See Brezak  
10 Fig. 2 Element 214); a content server proxy in communication with said client, said ticket  
11 authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) and receiving said first ticket  
12 (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0044); and a web server in communication with said client and  
13 said ticket authority (See Brezak Fig. 1 Element 178 and Paragraphs 0031-0032), wherein said  
14 content server proxy establishes a first communication session between said client and said  
15 content server proxy after said ticket authority validates said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs  
16 0043-0045), wherein said ticket authority enables said second ticket after said validation of said  
17 first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048), and wherein said content server proxy uses said  
18 enabled second ticket to establish a second communication session with a protocol different from  
19 said first communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraph 0045).

20 Regarding claim 67, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak  
21 Abstract and Fig.2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a first ticket authority  
22 (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 204 and Paragraph 0040); a second ticket authority (See Brezak Fig.

Art Unit: 2131

1 2 Element 206 and Paragraph 0040); a content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 214); and a  
2 content server proxy in communication with said client, said first ticket authority, and said  
3 content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210), wherein said first ticket authority generates a  
4 first ticket associated with said client, wherein said second ticket authority generates a second  
5 ticket associated with said content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0040, 0042-0043 and 0045),  
6 wherein said first ticket is transmitted to said client and used to establish a first communication  
7 session with said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045), and wherein said  
8 second ticket is transmitted to said content server proxy and used to establish a second  
9 communication session with said content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045).

10 Regarding claim 68, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak  
11 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising; means for generating, by a ticket authority, a ticket associated  
12 with a client, said ticket comprising a first ticket and a second ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs  
13 0042-0043 and 0045); means for transmitting, by said ticket authority, said first ticket to said  
14 client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043); means for using, by said client, said first ticket to  
15 establish a first communication session with a content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043  
16 and 0045); means for transmitting, by said ticket authority, said second ticket to said content  
17 server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045-0048); and means for using, by said content  
18 server proxy, said second ticket to establish a second communication session with a content  
19 server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048).

20 Regarding claims 2, 24, and 46, Brezak disclosed that prior to generating said  
21 ticket associated with said client, said client is authenticated with a web server (See Brezak  
22 Paragraphs 0042-0043).

Art Unit: 2131

1       Regarding claims 3, 25, and 47-48, Brezak disclosed that said ticket authority transmits  
2    said first ticket to a web server and said web server transmits said first ticket to said client (See  
3    Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032).

4       Regarding claims 4, 26, and 49, Brezak disclosed that said client transmits said first ticket  
5    to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0043 and 0044).

6       Regarding claims 5, 27, and 50-51, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy  
7    transmits said first ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority transmits said second  
8    ticket to said content server proxy upon validation of said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs  
9    0045-0048).

10       Regarding claims 6, 10, 28, 32, 52 and 56, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy  
11    transmits said second ticket to said content server upon said enabling of said second ticket (See  
12    Brezak Paragraph 0036 and 0045).

13       Regarding claims 11, 33-34, and 57-58, Brezak disclosed that said ticket authority  
14    transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to a web server and said web server  
15    transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraphs  
16    0031-0032 and 0042-0043).

17       Regarding claims 12, 35, and 59, Brezak disclosed that said client transmits said first  
18    ticket and said disabled second ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043  
19    and 0044).

20       Regarding claim 13, Brezak disclosed transmitting said disabled second ticket to at least  
21    one of said content server proxy and a web server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043).

Art Unit: 2131

1       Regarding claims 36, and 60, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy transmits  
2    said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority  
3    enables said disabled second ticket (See Brezak Paragraph 0045).

4       Regarding claims 14, 37, and 61, Brezak disclosed transmitting said enabled second  
5    ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0048).

6       Regarding claims 15, 38, and 62, Brezak disclosed that a communication session protocol  
7    is established between said client and said content server (See Brezak Paragraph 0036).

8       Regarding claims 16-17, 39-40, and 63-64, Brezak disclosed that a first communication  
9    session protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second  
10    communication session protocol is established between said content server proxy and said  
11    content server, wherein said first communication session protocol is different from said second  
12    communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0036 and 0043), said client  
13    communicating with said content server via said first communication session and said second  
14    communication session (See Brezak Paragraphs 0041, 0043, 0044, and Fig. 2).

15       Regarding claims 18-19, and 41-42, Brezak disclosed that a first communication session  
16    protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second  
17    communication session protocol is established between said client and a web server, wherein  
18    said first communication session protocol is different from said second communication session  
19    protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032 and 0043).

20       Regarding claims 21, 44, and 66, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy is a  
21    secure socket layer relay (See Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049, and 0053).

1                   ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2                   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all  
3                   obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

4                   *A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or  
5                   described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter  
6                   sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have  
7                   been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to  
8                   which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which  
9                   the invention was made.*

10

11                   Claims 20, 22, 43, and 65 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
12                   Brezak. Brezak a client system including many features such as accessing web sites (See Brezak  
13                   Paragraphs 0005 and 0016-0033), and transmitting a second ticket to a proxy server for the use  
14                   of a specifically identified server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049), but failed to disclose that  
15                   the client comprised a web browser or that the server was identified by its address. It was well  
16                   known in the art at the time of invention that computers had web browsers for accessing web  
17                   sites. It was further well known in the art at the time of invention that servers were identified by  
18                   their address. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at  
19                   the time of invention to provide the client with a web browser and to identify the target server by  
20                   its address. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would  
21                   have been motivated to apply what was well known and common in the art at the time.

22                   Claims 7-9, 29-31, and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable  
23                   over Brezak as applied to claims 1, 23, and 45 above, and further in view of Litai et al. (US  
24                   Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0233554) hereinafter referred to as Litai.

1 Brezak disclosed accessing a target server through a proxy server using a service ticket  
2 (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048) but failed to disclose the specific method used for the target  
3 server to verify the service ticket.

4 Litai teaches that in a ticketing system, in order for a server to verify a service ticket, the  
5 server sends the ticket to the ticket server (See Litai Paragraph 0046).

6 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of  
7 invention to employ the teachings of Litai in the ticketing system by having the target server  
8 send the service ticket to the trusted third party in order to have the ticket verified. This would  
9 have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to  
10 protect the server from unauthorized access.

12 *Conclusion*

13 Claims 1-68 have been rejected.

14 **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time  
15 policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

16 A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE  
17 MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO  
18 MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after  
19 the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period  
20 will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37  
21 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2131

1 however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing  
2 date of this final action.

3 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the  
4 examiner should be directed to Matthew T. Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790.

5 The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

6 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's  
7 supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the  
8 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

9 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent  
10 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications  
11 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished  
12 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR  
13 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR  
14 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would  
15 like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated  
16 information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 Matthew Henning  
24 Assistant Examiner  
25 Art Unit 2131  
26 6/5/2006

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100